

Substance Abuse in Nevada: A Data Book for Prevention Planning in Clark County

A Project of the Nevada Statewide Coalition Partnership and Coop Consulting, Inc., 2007

Goshen Community Development Coalition



ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS AND ATTRIBUTIONS

This publication is a product of the "Nevada Data Project". This and the other publications of the project were produced by the Nevada Statewide Coalition Partnership, a partnership of Nevada's substance abuse prevention coalitions, and Join Together Northern Nevada (JTNN), with JTNN serving as the project coordinator and fiscal agent. Coop Consulting, Inc., a private research and evaluation firm, was contracted by JTNN to lead the project design and implementation. An ad hoc Data and Evaluation Committee was formed to guide all aspects of the Data Project. The committee assisted Coop Consulting in the development of instruments, conceptual frameworks, benchmarks, survey management, and related tasks necessary to complete the project. Kevin Quint (Executive Director), Linda Lang, and Brandi Duncan of JTNN coordinated the statewide data collection effort of the coalitions. The members of the committee include:

Doreen Branch, Pacific Institute for Research and Evaluation

Cheryl Bricker, Partnership of Community Resources, Douglas County

Stevie Burden, Substance Abuse Prevention and Treatment Agency

Nancy Corn, Partnership Allied for Community Excellence, Elko

Vidya Kailash, Substance Abuse Prevention and Treatment Agency

Linda Lang, Nevada Statewide Coalition Partnership

Christy McGill, Healthy Communities Coalition of Lyon and Storey Counties

Kevin Quint, Join Together Northern Nevada, Reno

Stacy Smith, Nye Community Coalition

Belinda Thompson, Goshen Community Development Coalition, Las Vegas

Tonya Wolf, Substance Abuse Prevention and Treatment Agency



ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS (continued)

The archival and treatment data included in these publications was updated and compiled by Vidya Kailash of the Substance Abuse Prevention and Treatment Agency.

This publication was supported by the Nevada Department of Health and Human Services, Mental Health and Developmental Services Division, Substance abuse Prevention and Treatment Agency through the Federal State Incentive Grant Cooperative Agreement (CFDA #93.243) from the the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration's Center for Substance Abuse Prevention. Its contents are solely the responsibility of the authors and do not necessarily represent the official views of the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services nor the State of Nevada.

For further information about this publication and its contents, contact:

Join Together Northern Nevada
1325 Airmotive Way, #325
Reno, Nevada 89502
775-324-7557

The appendices of this document contain a contact list for all of the state's substance abuse prevention coalitions. Call your local community substance abuse prevention coalition today to see how you can help prevent substance abuse in your community.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION	PAGE A - 1
DEMOGRAPHICS & ARCHIVAL DATA	PAGE B - 1
REFERENCES	PAGE B - 7
TELEPHONE SURVEY FINDINGS	PAGE C - 1
CONVENIENCE SURVEY FINDINGS	PAGE D - 1
APPENDICES	APPENDICES
TELEPHONE SURVEY CALL STRATA	
CONTACT INFORMATION	

INTRODUCTION

This is a publication of the "Nevada Data Project". The project was implemented by the Nevada Statewide Coalition Partnership with funding from the Nevada State Incentive Grant (SIG), a Cooperative Agreement grant from the Center for Substance Abuse Prevention (CSAP), a division of the Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration (SAMHSA). The funding is administered by Nevada's Substance Abuse Prevention and Treatment Agency (SAPTA), an agency of the Nevada Mental Health and Developmental Services Division. Join Together Northern Nevada (JTNN), a substance abuse prevention coalition located in Reno and serving Washoe County, served as the coordinator and fiscal agent for the project. JTNN contracted with Coop Consulting, Inc., a research and evaluation firm, to lead the design and implementation of the project. An ad hoc Data and Evaluation Committee, made up of members of the Partnership and state staff from SAPTA, provided guidance in all aspects of the project.

The goal of the project was to collect comprehensive data for more effective prevention planning by Nevada's communities. To accomplish this goal, two primary data collection strategies were devised. One strategy was designed to obtain statistically reliable data about community and state-level substance abuse and related problems – a statewide random telephone survey with a sample sufficiently large enough to represent each of the state's coalitions was initiated to gather these data (384 was the targeted number of completed interviews from each geographic region). The second strategy was designed to obtain data from multiple sectors of the community that can serve as a local baseline measure of perceptions and norms about the severity of high risk and underage drinking and their consequences, and which can provide specific local information that can be used to target specific interventions – a local convenience survey was developed and implemented by the state's coalitions, collected from community sectors chosen by the coalitions (to obtain a sufficiently large enough sample in each area, each coalition agreed to collect 350 completed surveys). In both survey processes, the coalition target numbers were exceeded in most cases.

Archival data about key indicators are also important to community level planning. Large amounts of data are collected and compiled by state agencies that can be very useful. Data that have been published previously as part of Nevada's 2005 substance abuse Needs Assessment have been updated where possible and included in this project so as to provide the most comprehensive picture of the available data possible. Data include substance use indicators, along with data on some of the major consequences of use, and data reflecting common risk and protective factors associated with substance abuse behaviors. Treatment admission data may also prove useful for planning and are included in the state level report.

INTRODUCTION (CONTINUED)

TELEPHONE SURVEY



The statewide telephone survey was designed to solicit information about a range of substance abuse behaviors, beliefs and opinions, risks, and related resiliency items. The items in the survey were, to the extent possible, chosen from existing, validated, national surveys.

As the resulting survey instrument and implementation protocol are similar to those required for the nationally implemented Behavior Risk Factor Surveillance Survey (BRFSS), a Request for Proposal solicited bids from national survey firms with demonstrated experience implementing the BRFSS and similar rigorous survey protocols. JTNN selected and contracted with the Burlington, Vermont office of Macro International Inc. (Macro) to perform the survey's data collection. The statewide telephone survey was implemented from April through July of 2007. Data collection was conducted via telephone surveys with randomly selected adults in randomly selected, telephone-equipped Nevada households.

The telephone survey sample of numbers was drawn from the total non-institutionalized Nevadan adult population (ages 18 and older) residing in telephone-equipped dwellings. This population excluded adults: (1) in penal, mental, or other institutions; (2) living in other group quarters such as dormitories, barracks, convents, or boarding houses; (3) contacted at their second home during a stay of less than 30 days; (4) living in a home without a telephone; and (5) who do not speak English well enough to be interviewed, except for Spanish-speaking respondents, who were then interviewed by Spanish-speaking interviewers. The resulting sample provided for a proportional-to-adult population, stratified, statewide random sample of telephone-equipped Nevada households. At the conclusion of the survey period, 4,678 telephone interviews were completed.

The survey's sample design specified a list-assisted, random digit dial (RDD) sample of Nevada's telephone-equipped households. The list-assisted RDD procedure assures that households with telephone numbers assigned since the publication of current directories, as well as those with deliberately unlisted numbers, are sampled in their correct proportions. List-assisted state RDD samples are generated by first preparing, and then maintaining, an up-to-date list of all current operating telephone exchanges (three-digit prefixes) in Nevada's area codes. These telephone exchanges, when combined with all four-digit numbers from 0000 to 9999, constitute the set of all possible working Nevada telephone numbers, both residential and non-residential.

This set of all possible telephone numbers is then arranged in ascending order by exchange and suffix, and divided into blocks of 100 numbers each. Cross-reference directories are utilized to determine which of these blocks contain at least one listed residential number (a.k.a. one-plus blocks). The one-plus blocks are then matched to a database of listed phone numbers to identify whether the phone number is listed or unlisted. A random sample of telephone numbers is drawn from the one-plus blocks, sampling listed numbers relative to unlisted numbers at a 1.5:1 ratio. This procedure assures that all new and unlisted numbers are sampled in their correct proportions.

TELEPHONE SURVEY (CONTINUED)

The JTNN Needs Assessment main study included a stratified sample design. This design specified ten geographic strata that encompassed the entire state (these ten geographic areas represent the coverage areas of the state's substance abuse prevention coalitions), plus one strata that comprised a Hispanic surname oversample. Each geographic area was made up of one or more Nevada counties.

Macro purchased a random sample of telephone numbers from Genesys, a national vendor that provides lists of precisely generated telephone numbers, as required by the JTNN contract. These records were pre-screened for non-working and business numbers and configured in batches of 50. An initial sample load of 16,830 records was released on April 23; 16,800 additional records were released on May 9, and 15,150 more on May 16.

Data collection began April 19th, 2007 and ended on July 26th, 2007. The sample design called for a minimum total of 4,220 completed interviews. The target for each strata (each coalition geographic area) was 384 completes. In all, 4,648 interviews were collected. Completes by strata are detailed in the appendix. A computer-assisted telephone interviewing (CATI) approach was implemented for data collection. The telephone survey was fielded from Macro's Plattsburgh, New York CATI Research Center, as well as their sister company, Opinion Research Corporation's, Tucson, Arizona, and Reno, Nevada CATI Research Centers. The telephone survey followed a 15-attempt protocol, in which 15 attempts were made until a final disposition was obtained.

Experienced, supervised personnel conducted the JTNN Needs Assessment interviews using Computers for Marketing Corporation's (CfMC) CATI software package. To maximize response rates, Macro concentrated calls in the respondent's time zone between 5 p.m. and 9 p.m. Monday through Friday; and between 9 a.m. and 7 p.m. on Saturday and Sunday. A portion of calls was conducted between 9 a.m. and 5 p.m. Monday through Friday, in order to complete interviews with respondents who were only at home during the day. The average interview length was 18.8 minutes. Screening to randomly select a respondent in the household took approximately 1.5 minutes.

CONVENIENCE SURVEY

Brief convenience surveys can be useful tools in collecting local data that give very specific information for targeted assessment and planning purposes. To that end, adult, youth, and a Native American convenience survey instruments were developed. These were implemented from March through June 2007 by every community coalition. A total of 8,924 surveys were collected, on paper, from every community in Nevada. These surveys were completed through a broad range of strategies, including one-on-one interview sessions, door-to-door collection strategies, in front of key business locations in communities where a broad range of the population could reasonably be expected to frequent, e-mail strategies, community and focus group collection strategies, and other creative, grass roots approaches. The very large return rate is a reflection of the success of community coalitions in devising these collection strategies.

The goal of these convenience surveys was to collect information about local norms and perceptions of use, ease of access, severity of community behaviors, severity of underage binge drinking and related problems, and similar issues. This data can help local communities determine where and how to focus their efforts when they complete community action plans in the future.

The survey was distributed and collected by each community coalition. Completed surveys were submitted to Coop Consulting for data entry and analysis. JTNN managed the submission and tracking process for this project element.

ABOUT THIS PUBLICATION

This publication consists of three major components: the results of a statewide telephone survey implemented by a national telephone research company, the results of convenience surveys implemented by all of the state's substance abuse prevention coalitions, and archival data provided by the Substance Abuse Prevention and Treatment Agency (SAPTA). A fourth component, treatment admission data, is included in the state level report.

DEMOGRAPHICS

County: Clark

Population Estimate[1]		
	Number	**Percent**
Age 0-18	532,311	26.9
Age 19-44	770,093	38.9
Age 45-64	463,541	23.4
Age 65+	215,853	10.9
Total	**1,981,798**	**100**

Race Ethnicity Estimate[1]		
	Number	**Percent**
Native American/Alaskan	16,980	0.9
Asian/Pacific Islander	150,188	7.6
Black/African American	176,518	8.9
Latino/Hispanic	534,904	27.0
White	1,103,208	55.7
Total	**1,981,798**	**100**

ARCHIVAL DATA

County: Clark

Community Domain

Availability of Drugs [2]	County		Nevada	
	Number	Per 1,000	Number	Per 1,000
Youth Accessible Tobacco Outlets	1,321	2.5 per 1,000 youth	1,974	2.7 per 1,000 youth
Liquor Licenses	1,652	.83	3,411	1.2

Transition & Mobility [3]	County		Nevada	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Owner occupied housing	302,834	59.1	457,248	60.9
Renter occupied housing	209,419	40.9	293,918	39.1
Ten Year Percent Change [1] (1997-2007)	788,410	66.1% Growth	947,773	53.1% Growth

Low Neighborhood Attachment [4]	County		Nevada	
	Number		Number	
Active Voters	792,302	56.2%	1,186,656	60.3%
Correctional Facility Inmates	2,594	2.1 per 1,000 adults	4,223	2.4 per 1,000 adults

Extreme Economic Deprivation[5]	County		Nevada	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Persons Below Poverty Level (2004)	198,979	11.6	266,984	11.1
Children Below Poverty Level (2003)	68,221	16.5	91,562	15.8
Unemployment (2006)	38,261	2.0	54,217	2.1
Food Stamp Recipients (*SFY 07)	89,675	4.5	118,923	4.4
TANF (*SFY 07)	13,940	0.7	17,586	0.6
Free/Reduced Lunch (School Year 05-06)	133,832	45.6	171,118	41.5
Median Household Income (2004)	$45,793		$47,231	
Low Birth Weight (2004)	2,150	8.2	2,799	7.96

ARCHIVAL DATA

County: Clark

Family Domain

Family History of Problem Behavior and Family Management Problems [6]	County		Nevada	
	Number	Per 100,000	Number	Per 100,000
Reported Child Abuse/Neglect (2002)	1912	4.8	2,875	5.1
Female/No Husband Present (1999)	60,351	11.8	83,482	11.1
Non-High School Graduates (2000)	184,998	20.6	253,374	19.4

Family Conflict [7]	County		Nevada	
	Number	Per 100,000	Number	Per 100,000
Divorce (2003)	11,964	9.9	16,335	9.5
Reported Domestic Violence (2005)	26,567	1,340.6	31,237	1,143.8

Parental Attitudes/Involvement [8]	County		Nevada	
	Number	Per 1,000	Number	Per 1,000
Adult Drug Related Arrests (2005)	7,923	6.1	10,608	5.8
Adult Alcohol Related Arrests (2005)	10,130	7.8	15,796	8.6
Adult Property Crime Arrests (2005)	11,228	8.6	14,990	8.2
Adult Violent Crime Arrests (2005)	7,668	5.9	19,786	10.8

ARCHIVAL DATA

County: Clark

School Domain

Commitment to School	County	Nevada
	Percent	Percent
H.S. Dropout Rate (School Year 05-06) [9]	7.1	5.7
Average Student Attendance (School Year 05-06) [10]	93.5	93.7
Student Graduation Rate (School Year 05-06) [10]	60.1	64.9

Incidents occurring at school [11] (2005-2006 school year)	County		Nevada	
	Number	Per 1,000 students	Number	Per 1,000 Students
Violent Incidents	7,223	24.6	10,052	24.4
Weapon Incidents	454	1.5	794	1.8
Substance Incidents	511	1.7	1,226	3.0
Habitual Offenders	22	0.1	81	0.2
Truants	650	2.2	1,702	4.1

ARCHIVAL DATA

County: Clark

Individual/Peer Domain

Problem Behavior [12]	County		Nevada	
	Number	Per 1,000 youth <18	Number	Per 1,000 youth <18
Youth Suicide (2004)	8	.02	11	.02
	Number	Per 1,000 Fem. 15-17	Number	Per 1,000 Fem. 15-17
Teen Birth Rate (2004)	2,790	48.8	3,783	46.59

Juvenile Justice Referrals [13]	County		Nevada	
	Number	Per 1,000 youth <18	Number	Per 1,000 youth <18
Alcohol Related	868	3.9	2,209	6.7
Drug Related	1,393	6.2	2,295	7.0
Property Related	5,783	25.9	8,687	26.3
Weapons Related	370	1.7	475	1.4

Alcohol & Drug Associated Traffic Crashes [14]	County		Nevada	
	Number	Per 1,000	Number	Per 1,000
Alcohol/Drug Related Fatalities (2002)	93	0.06	162	0.07
Alcohol/Drug Related Injury Crashes (2002)	1470	0.95	2,010	0.91
Alcohol/Drug Related Crashes (2002)	3109	2.01	4,314	1.96
Alcohol/Drug Related Fatalities (2005)	98	0.05	159	0.06

Hospital Data for Discharges & Deaths[15]	County		Nevada	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Drug/Alcohol Related Discharges	3,916	2.4	5,188	2.3
	Number	Per 1,000	Number	Per 1,000
Drug/Alcohol Related Deaths	376	23.2	652	28.5

ARCHIVAL DATA

County: Clark

Individual/Peer Domain (continued)

AIDS, HIV and Sexually Transmitted Disease [16]	County		Nevada	
	Number	Per 100,000	Number	Per 100,000
AIDS	224	11.8	253	9.6
HIV	298	15.7	332	12.6
Chlamydia	6,592	348.3	8,299	316.1
Gonorrhea	2,477	130.9	2,766	105.3
Syphilis	132	7.0	136	5.2

REFERENCES

1. Population Estimate/Race Ethnicity Estimate -Nevada State Demographer. 2006 Population Estimates. *Data updated June 2007*

2. Youth Accessible Tobacco Outlets - Attorney General's Office. 2007 Synar database. *Data updated July 2007*

   Liquor Licenses - Bartosz, Kathy, Statewide Coordinator, Enforcing Underage Drinking Laws Project. July 2007 email to requestor. Nevada Division of Child and Family Services. Nevada EUDL Program.
   Clark County Liquor Licenses – Clark County Department of Business License, data obtained from department website. *August 2007*

3. Owner/Renter Occupied Housing – U.S. Census Bureau. Census 2000. Nevada. *Data updated 2005*

4. Active Voters – Nevada Secretary of State. 2007 Nevada Voter Registration Statistics. *Data updated June 2007*

   Correctional Facility Inmates – Nevada Department of Corrections. *Data updated February 2005*.

5. Persons Below Poverty Level – U.S. Census Bureau. State & County QuickFacts. Nevada. *Data updated July 2007.*

   Children Below Poverty Level – The Center for Business and Economic Research, University of Nevada, Las Vegas. 2007 Nevada Kids Count Internet Data Book. *Data updated July 2007*

   Unemployment – Nevada Department of Employment, Training & Rehabilitation. Nevada Workforce Informer. 2007 Labor Force Data. *Data updated July 2007*

   Food Stamp Recipients – Nevada Division of Welfare and Supportive Services. Fiscal Year 2007 Caseload Summaries. *The number of Food Stamp recipients does not include data for May & June SFY 07. *Data updated July 2007*

   TANF – Nevada Division of Welfare and Supportive Services. Fiscal Year 2007 Caseload Summaries. * The number of TANF recipients does not include data for June SFY 07. *Data updated July 2007*

   Free/Reduced Lunch – Nevada Department of Education. 2005-2006 State Accountability Summary Report. *Data updated July 2007*

REFERENCES (continued)

5. (continued)

Median Household Income – U.S. Census Bureau. State & County QuickFacts. Nevada. *Data updated July 2007.*

Low Birth Weight – Nevada State Health Division. Nevada Interactive Health Databases. *Data updated July 2007.*

6. Reported Child Abuse/Neglect – Nevada Division of Child and Family Services. Nevada Child Abuse Neglect Statistics. 2002-2003. *Data updated 2005*

Female/No Husband Present – U.S. Census Bureau. Census 2000. Nevada. *Data updated 2005*

Non-High School Graduates – U.S. Census Bureau. Census 2000. Nevada. *Data updated 2005*

7. Divorce – United States. Nevada Vital Statistics, Center for Health Data Research. Nevada Vital Statistics 2004, Divorces by County of Residence, Nevada Residents, 1999-2003. *Data updated April 2005.*

Reported Domestic Violence – Nevada Department of Public Safety. Crime and Justice in Nevada 2005. *Data updated July 2007*

8. Adult Drug Related Arrests/ Adult Alcohol Related Arrests/ Adult Property Crime Arrests/ Adult Violent Crime Arrests – Nevada Department of Public Safety, Crime and Justice in Nevada 2005. *Data updated July 2007*

9. High School Dropout Rate - Nevada Department of Education. 2005-2006 State Accountability Summary Report. *Data updated June 2007*

10. Average Student Attendance/ Student Graduation Rate - Nevada Department of Education. 2005-2006 State Accountability Summary Report. *Data updated June 2007*

11. Violent Incidents/ Weapon Incidents/ Substance Incidents/ Habitual Offenders/ Truants – Nevada Department of Education. 2005 -2006 State Accountability Summary Report. *Data updated July 2007*

12. Youth Suicide/ Teen Birthrate – State Health Division. Nevada Interactive Health Databases. *Data updated July 2007.*

13. Juvenile Justice Referrals: Alcohol Related/Drug Related/ Property Related/ Weapons Related – Nevada Division of Child and Family Services. Juvenile Justice Data. SFY 04. *Data updated June 2007*

REFERENCES (continued)

14. Alcohol and/or Drug Related Fatalities/ Alcohol and/or Drug Related Injury Crashes/ Alcohol and/or Drug Related Crashes – Nevada State Health Division. Health Planning and Vital Statistics. *Data updated 2005*

Alcohol Related Traffic Fatalities – U.S. Department of Transportation. National Highway Traffic Safety Administration. Fatality Analysis Reports System. *Data updated July 2007*

15. Drug and/or Alcohol Related Hospital Discharges/ Deaths – Nevada State Health Division. Health Planning and Vital Statistics. *Data updated 2005*

16. HIV/AIDS cases – Spaulding, Julia. July 2007 email to Requestor. Nevada State Health Division. HIV/STD/TB Program. *Data updated July 2007*

Chlamydia/ Gonorrhea/ Syphilis – Hill, Bill. July 2007 email to Requestor. Nevada State Health Division. HIV/ STD/TB Program. *Data updated July 2007*

17. Youth Underage Drinking/Drug Use & Youth Perception of Risk – Nevada Youth Risk Behavior Survey, 2005. Nevada Department of Education. *Data updated August 2007*

18. Adult Alcohol Use – 2006 Behavioral Risk Factor Surveillance System. National Center for Chronic Disease Prevention and Health Promotion. Nevada Prevalence Data for Alcohol Consumption. *Data updated August 2007*

NEVADA STATEWIDE TELEPHONE SURVEY: DATA FROM CLARK COUNTY, SERVED BY BEST COMMUNITY COALITION, AND GOSHEN COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT COALITION

The design of the Nevada statewide telephone survey consisted of a random sample of adults aged 18 and above from each of ten geographic regions of the state, plus a sample of Hispanic adults from Clark County. These ten regions are the coverage area of the state's substance abuse prevention coalitions, and together constitute all of Nevada. These regions range in size from one county to three counties. The multi-county coalition areas of the state reflect contiguous groupings of counties with small populations. The breakdown of these regions is reflected in the table below. An additional sample was purchased of Hispanic surname households in Clark County in order to provide data for use by the Hispanic community coalition in that county.

Nevada Coalition	County/-ies in coverage area
BEST Community Coalition	Clark County (shared sample with Goshen)
Churchill Community Coalition	Churchill County
Community Council on Youth	Carson City
Eastern Nevada Community Coalition	Eureka, Lincoln, and White Pine Counties
Frontier Community Coalition	Humboldt, Lander, and Pershing Counties
Goshen Community Development Coalition	Clark County (shared sample with BEST)
Healthy Communities Coalition	Lyon, Storey, and Mineral Counties
Join Together Northern Nevada	Washoe County
Luz Community Development Coalition	Clark County – Hispanic community (standalone sample)
Nye Community Coalition	Esmeralda and Nye Counties
Partners Allied for Community Excellence	Elko County
Partnership of Community Resources	Douglas County
Statewide Native American Coalition	Twenty-seven tribal communities across state and urban area Native Americans (all Native telephone survey participants are included in counties above; not a separate sample)

The survey protocol was designed with a targeted number of 384 participants from all of the areas described above. In many areas of the state, the final sample of completed telephone interviews exceeded this target number. Individual county random samples of adults from every county were not possible due to the very small populations of some of the state's counties. For this reason the breakdown of coalition coverage areas was used to gather a sufficient total sample for this survey. A total of 4,648 completed telephone interviews was obtained. This report concentrates on respondents contacted in Clark County, which is served by BEST Coalition and Goshen Community Development Coalition.

The table below provides a breakdown of respondents (completed interviews) by county of residence.

COUNTY	NUMBER	PERCENT
CLARK	362	94.5
DOUGLAS	1	.3
WHITE PINE	1	.3
OTHER (SPECIFY)	2	.5
DON'T KNOW	366	95.6
REFUSED	17	4.4
Total	383	100.0

Zip Codes	Number	Percent
89002	10	2.6
89005	4	1.0
89006	1	.3
89011	3	.8
89012	8	2.1
89014	10	2.6
89015	6	1.6
89019	1	.3
89027	4	1.0
89029	3	.8
89030	11	2.9
89031	9	2.3
89032	10	2.6
89040	1	.3
89044	4	1.0
89052	11	2.9
89074	6	1.6
89081	4	1.0
89084	4	1.0
89086	1	.3
89101	9	2.3
89102	6	1.6
89103	4	1.0
89104	8	2.1
89106	7	1.8

Zip Codes	Number	Percent
89107	13	3.4
89108	17	4.4
89109	2	.5
89110	7	1.8
89113	6	1.6
89115	13	3.4
89117	11	2.9
89118	3	.8
89119	8	2.1
89120	4	1.0
89121	14	3.7
89122	11	2.9
89123	14	3.7
89124	1	.3
89128	8	2.1
89129	8	2.1
89130	4	1.0
89131	9	2.3
89134	5	1.3
89135	7	1.8
89138	2	.5
89141	2	.5
89142	6	1.6
89143	1	.3
89144	5	1.3
89145	7	1.8
89146	1	.3
89147	6	1.6
89148	1	.3
89149	10	2.6
89156	3	.8
89169	4	1.0
89178	3	.8
89183	1	.3
89418	1	.3
Total	363	94.8
Missing	20	5.2
Total with Missing	383	100.0

Following reporting convention, percentage calculations are rounded and in some cases in this report will not sum to 100%.

DEMOGRAPHICS

The demographic information that follows reflects survey data on all respondents' age, marital status, employment status, income, education level, and race. Answers are shown in the tables below.

The total random telephone survey sample included respondents who ranged in age from 18 to 90 years. The average age of this sample was 49.68 years.

Gender

	Number	Percent
Female	229	59.8
Male	154	40.2
Total	383	100.0

Marital Status

Status	Number	Percent
Married	205	53.5
Divorced	55	14.4
Widowed	34	8.9
Separated	9	2.3
Never Married	54	14.1
A Member of an Unmarried Couple	19	5.0
Total	376	98.2
Missing	7	1.8
Total with Missing	383	100.0

Employment Status

Status	Number	Percent
Employed for Wages	174	45.4
Self-Employed	37	9.7
Out of Work for More than a Year	2	.5
Out of Work for Less than a Year	6	1.6
A Homemaker	41	10.7
A Student	6	1.6
Unable to Work	23	6.0
Total	289	75.5
Missing	94	24.5
Total	383	100.0

DEMOGRAPHICS CONTINUED

Income

Amount	Number	Percent
Less than $10,000	11	2.9
$10,000 to less than $15,000	11	2.9
$15,000 to less than $25,000	14	3.7
$20,000 to less than $25,000	36	9.4
$25,000 to less than $35,000	33	8.6
$35,000 to less than $50,000	54	14.1
$75,000 or more	88	23.0
Total	247	64.5
Missing	136	35.5
Total with Missing	383	100.0

Education

Completed	Number	Percent
Never attended or only kindergarten	2	.5
Grades 1 through 8 (elementary)	11	2.9
Grades 9 through 11 (some high school)	20	5.2
Grade 12 or GED (high school)	111	29.0
1 to 3 years of college	120	31.3
College graduate	113	29.5
Total	377	98.4
Missing	6	1.6
Total with Missing	383	100.0

Race

Race	Number	Percent
White	281	73.4
Black or African American	30	7.8
Asian	8	2.1
Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander	8	2.1
American Indian	5	1.3
Total	332	86.7
Missing	51	13.3
Total with Missing	383	100.0

DEMOGRAPHICS CONTINUED

Hispanic / Latino Status

	Number	Percent
Yes	60	15.7
No	320	83.6
Total	380	99.2
Missing	3	.8
Total with Missing	383	100.0

CHILDREN AND FAMILIES

Number of Children Under the Age of 18 in Your Household

Number of Children	Number	Percent
None	253	66.1
One	49	12.8
Two	55	14.4
Three	15	3.9
Four	8	2.1
Five	1	.3
Total	381	99.5
Missing	2	.5
Total with Missing	383	100.0

A total of 128 respondents, or 33%, reported having one or more children in their household under the age of 18 years.

Are you the Parent or Guardian of these Children?

	Number	Percent
Yes	113	29.5
No	16	4.2
Total	129	33.7
Missing	254	66.3
Total with Missing	383	100.0

A total of 113, or 88%, of those reporting having children under the age of 18 in their household are also the parents or guardians of those children.

Respondents who had young children were asked how many hours their children were in daycare or childcare programs.

CHILDREN AND FAMILIES CONTINUED

Hours per week children in daycare

Number of hours per week	Number	Percent
0	48	12.5
1-10	13	3.4
11-20	3	.8
31-40	8	2.1
41+	3	.8
Total	75	19.6
Missing	308	80.4
Total with Missing	383	100.0

Hours per week children in after-school

Number of hours per week	Number	Percent
0	73	19.1
1-5	12	3.1
6-10	4	1.0
11-15	2	.5
21+	1	.3
Total	92	24.0
Missing	291	76.0
Total with Missing	383	100.0

COMMUNITY INVOLVEMENT

Respondents were asked how many hours per week and per month they spent volunteering in their community. One way to look at the strength of various communities is to see how much time people spend volunteering. Community involvement, hours spent outside work and home in a volunteer capacity are factors in understanding community strengths. In the tables below, 70 respondents, or just over 18%, report volunteering each week in their community, and 89, or 23%, report participating in community service activities.

Hours per week spent volunteering

Number of hours per week	Number	Percent
0	308	80.4
1-2	21	5.5
3-4	20	5.2
5+	29	7.6
Total	378	98.7
Missing	5	1.3
Total with Missing	383	100.0

COMMUNITY INVOLVEMENT CONTINUED

Hours spent in community service activities per month

Number of hours per month	Number	Percent
0	291	76.0
1-3	25	6.5
4-6	23	6.0
7-10	20	5.2
11-15	8	2.1
16+	13	3.4
Total	380	99.2
Missing	3	.8
Total with Missing	383	100.0

Positive adult presence, outside the family, can be very important for youth, often leading to less risky behaviors and creating adolescent resiliency. Respondents were asked if they had a mentoring or nurturing relationship with youth other than their own children in the community.

Have mentoring relationship with Community Youth



Research suggests that family time spent in non-television related activities-- such as games, reading, sports, discussions, exercise, craft projects, school activities, hobbies, etc.—is beneficial to child mental and physical health outcomes. These types of activities are also important in building positive family relationships that support healthy youth development. Questions were asked to reflect what types of activities parents were involved in with their children and facility/frequency of discussion on drugs, including alcohol. The data below, which are frequently about family behaviors, should be understood within the context of the 113 adults, reported above, who are the parent or guardian of one or more children in their household.

COMMUNITY INVOLVEMENT CONTINUED

Times family had dinner together without TV on

Number of times in the past week	Number	Percent
0	26	6.8
1-2	14	3.7
3-4	31	8.1
5-7	41	10.7
Total	112	29.2
Missing	271	70.8
Total with Missing	383	100.0

Of the 113 adults who reported being a parent or guardian of children in the household, 86, or 76%, report having dinner together without the TV on at least once during the past week.

Number of times you attended religious or spiritual services with your children in the past three months?

Number of times in past 3 months	Number	Percent
0	45	11.7
1-3	17	4.4
4-6	12	3.1
7-10	4	1.0
11+	33	8.6
Total	111	29.0
Missing	272	71.0
Total with Missing	383	100.0

Respondents were asked if they felt they had the knowledge to talk to their children about alcohol and drugs, and how often those conversations occurred.



COMMUNITY INVOLVEMENT CONTINUED

How many times have you talked to your children about drug and alcohol issues during the past three months?

Number of times in past 3 months	Number	Percent
0	19	5.0
1-2	14	3.7
3-5	23	6.0
6-8	11	2.9
9+	26	6.8
Child is too young for this topic	19	5.0
Total	112	29.2
Missing	271	70.8
Total with Missing	383	100.0

PERCEPTION OF RISK

Perception of risk addresses the likelihood that a respondent believes there will be a negative consequence of a particular activity. This can provide various ways for communities to consider planning for community level change. The sections below show respondents' perception of risk related to alcohol use, access, and drinking and driving.

Perceived Risk of Underage Drinking and Underage Drinking and Driving

Research suggests that the degree of perceived risk of specific, immediate consequences of (in this case underage drinking and drinking and driving) can determine the likelihood of that behavior.

The items related on the graph below look at:

- how likely the respondents thought it was that someone underage who was drinking would be caught by the police;
- how likely someone under 21 who was drinking and driving would be to lose their license;
- how likely it was that nothing would happen to someone under 21 who was caught drinking and driving (this item was reverse-coded to match response direction of the two questions above).

Items in the survey were combined to create a scale that measures perceived risk with regard to underage drinking and underage drinking and driving. Each of the items was scored on a scale that ranged from 1 = very likely to 4 = very unlikely (the ratings were added and divided by 4 to create a scale score between 1 and 4).

PERCEPTION OF RISK CONTINUED

The following graphs provide the average ratings for each of the coalition areas in the state. The Luz Coalition is representative of Clark County Hispanics and the Statewide Native American Coalition includes Nevada Native Americans from all the Tribes in the state.

Perceived Risk of Underage Drinking/Underage Drinking and Driving



The average score of 2.54 indicates that respondents think there is little perception of risk that underage youth will suffer any consequences for drinking alcohol or for drinking and driving. A scale score of 2.5 is a neutral score, the midpoint between very likely and very unlikely.

Perceived Risk of Drinking and Driving Behaviors

Motor vehicle-related injuries are a leading cause of death in Nevada; this includes minors affected by alcohol-related accidents. The information below deals with perceptions of risk involved in drinking and driving, and the likelihood of being impacted if driving under the influence (DUI).

Perception of drinking and driving risks are measured in the section below through the following survey items:

- likelihood of being stopped by the police when driving with more than the legal blood alcohol limit;
- likelihood of being convicted if you were stopped and charged with DUI;
- likelihood of being arrested if stopped by the police for DUI.

PERCEPTION OF RISK CONTINUED

Ratings were summed as for the previous scale and average score for the sample identified in the following graph and compared to other coalition areas in the state.



The average state score of 1.738 indicates that respondents think it is somewhat likely that people will suffer consequences of drinking and driving.

Perceived Risk of Providing Alcohol to Minors and Intoxicated Patrons

An important aspect of alcohol use is how minors and intoxicated persons obtain alcohol, where it is purchased, and consequences of selling to underage persons. The graph reflects the perceived risk of selling alcohol to a minor or an intoxicated person. A risk scale for illegally providing alcohol was constructed from two survey items:

- the likelihood of being arrested for selling alcohol to an intoxicated person;
- the likelihood of being given a citation and fined for giving or selling alcohol to someone under 21 years of age.

PERCEPTION OF RISK CONTINUED

Perceived Risk of Providing/Selling Alcohol to Minors or Intoxicated Persons



The average state score of 2.16 indicates that respondents think it is only somewhat likely that people will suffer consequences of selling alcohol to minors and intoxicated persons (1 = very likely, 4 = very unlikely).

Respondents also were asked about the consequences of selling to someone less than 21 years of age.

Consequences for selling alcohol to minors

Possibility	Number	Percent
They would be fined	187	48.8
Lose their license to sell	100	26.1
They would go to jail	49	12.8
Nothing would happen	36	9.4
Total	372	97.1
Missing	11	2.9
Total with Missing	383	100.0

How frequent and present are police sobriety checkpoints? The awareness of enforcement activity is one of the key predictors of perception of risk. Information below reflects how many times respondents had been through a sobriety checkpoint in the past year, which can serve as one measure of awareness of the level of enforcement activity.

PERCEPTION OF RISK CONTINUED

Number of times through a sobriety checkpoint in the past year?

Times in the past year	Number	Percent
0	354	92.4
1	13	3.4
2	11	2.9
3	1	.3
Total	379	99.0
Missing	4	1.0
Total with Missing	383	100.0

Responses ranged from 0 to 3 with the majority of responses 0. The average number of times for the entire sample was .10 (almost 0) indicating that sobriety checkpoints are very infrequent.

Perception of Harm to Self

Another question focused on the risk of harming themselves physically and in other ways when they have 5 or more drinks of alcohol once or twice a week. Binge and heavy drinking is associated with multiple poor health outcomes, including addiction, disability due to injury, early death, and physical and mental health problems. The average rating for harm to self was 3.34 indicating that respondents thought 5 or more drinks at one sitting once or twice a week is a great risk.

Risk	Number	Percent
No Risk	14	3.7
Slight Risk	50	13.1
Moderate Risk	107	27.9
Great Risk	207	54.0
Total	378	98.7
Missing	5	1.3
Total with Missing	383	100.0

Overall Perception of Risk

How does a community perceive risk? What is the perceived impact of alcohol use on a community? The graph below includes all risk items discussed above. It is a global measure of a community's perception of the risks associated with getting caught drinking if underage, drinking and driving, selling alcohol to minors and intoxicated patrons and harm to self from binge drinking.

PERCEPTION OF RISK CONTINUED



The state average of 2.14 indicates that respondents felt it was only somewhat likely that people experience consequences from underage drinking, getting caught drinking if underage, drinking and driving, selling alcohol to minors and intoxicated patrons and harm to self from binge drinking (the midpoint risk measure on this scale is 2.5; risk is very likely = 1, risk is very unlikely = 4).

NORMS

Norms provide the context for behavior choices. Respondents were asked whether they agreed or disagreed that parents should not let their children or their children's friends who are under 18 years of age drink alcohol at home. Respondents used a five point rating from strongly agree to strongly disagree.

Strongly agree	255	66.6
Agree	54	14.1
Neither agree nor disagree	21	5.5
Disagree	31	8.1
Strongly disagree	20	5.2
Total	381	99.5
Missing	2	.5
Total with Missing	383	100.0

PRICING

Do pricing strategies increase retail sales? The table below shows whether respondents agree that they are more likely to buy alcohol from a store that advertises discount pricing on alcohol.

Rating	Number	Percent
I don't buy alcohol	73	19.1
Strongly agree	69	18.0
Agree	64	16.7
Neither agree nor disagree	73	19.1
Disagree	58	15.1
Strongly disagree	44	11.5
Total	381	99.5
Missing	2	.5
Total with Missing	383	100.0

PROMOTION

How prominent is advertising for alcohol at public events? The information below reflects how often respondents see alcohol advertising at sporting and other events they might attend.

Rating	Number	Percent
I don't attend these events	26	6.8
A lot	189	49.3
Sometimes	119	31.1
Never	39	10.2
Total	373	97.4
Missing	10	2.6
Total with Missing	383	100.0

ENFORCEMENT OF ALCOHOL LAWS

What is the perception of enforcement of alcohol laws in Nevada? Should sobriety checkpoints be a regular part of police activity? Respondents were asked if they agree that police should conduct regular sobriety checkpoints to detect drinking and driving. The table below details their responses.

Rating	Number	Percent
Strongly agree	248	64.8
Agree	100	26.1
Neither agree nor disagree	15	3.9
Disagree	15	3.9
Strongly disagree	4	1.0
Total	382	99.7
Missing	1	.3
Total with Missing	383	100.0

Are enforcement practices sufficient? The table below details respondent perception as to whether Nevada's enforcement of drinking and driving laws was appropriate, ranking from "too strict" to "not strict enough".

Rating	Number	Percent
Too strict	14	3.7
Not strict enough	167	43.6
Just about right	123	32.1
Total	304	79.4
Missing	79	20.6
Total with Missing	383	100.0

How prominent are police efforts in the community in dealing with drinking and driving?

The graphs below show whether respondents have heard or seen anything about police setting up sobriety checkpoints or other enforcement efforts to catch drivers who were driving while under the influence of alcohol, and whether the respondent has been arrested for DUI in the past year.

ENFORCEMENT OF ALCOHOL LAWS CONTINUED

Heard anything about alcohol law enforcment activities?



Have you been arrested for DWI in the past year?

RETAIL ACCESS BY INTOXICATED PATRONS

Two items measured retail access issues related to sales to patrons already intoxicated. One question asked if the respondent had seen other people served alcohol when they were already intoxicated during the past 30 days and the other question asked if during the past 30 days the respondent had been served alcohol when they had already had too much to drink. These items were combined into a scale with 1 = yes and 2 = no. Lower scores (closer to 1) indicate that the respondents did not see or experience alcohol control measures through beverage servers or sales people, but instead observed alcohol being made readily available to intoxicated persons.

RETAIL ACCESS BY INTOXICATED PATRONS CONTINUED

ACCESS TO ALCOHOL FOR MINORS

Three items asked about access to alcohol by minors. The first question asked respondents (N=11 minors in the sample) how easy it is for them to get alcohol.

Difficulty	Number	Percent without Missing
Very difficult	1	9.1
Somewhat easy	4	36.4
Very easy	6	54.5
Total	11	100.0
Missing	372	
Total with Missing	383	

ACCESS TO ALCOHOL FOR MINORS CONTINUED

This was followed by a question that asked the minors who responded how they got their alcohol.

Where	Number	Percent without Missing
I did not drink alcohol during the past 30 days	8	72.7
I got it from a friend or acquaintance of my parents	1	9.1
I bought it myself using a fake ID at a store	1	9.1
Don't know / not sure	1	9.1
Total	11	100.0
Missing	372	
Total with Missing	383	

Was your ID checked during alcohol purchases in the past 30 days?

SUPPORT FOR ALCOHOL POLICY

Five questions at the end of the interview measured respondents' attitudes (strongly favor to strongly oppose) regarding specific legislative and policy controls for alcohol. These questions included:

- Should advertisements for alcoholic beverages within our communities be restricted to making drinking less appealing to kids?
- Alcohol companies often sponsor special events so that they can advertise and sell alcohol there. How strongly would you favor or oppose a recommendation to community planners that they refuse sponsorship by alcohol companies for events attended by teens?
- Increasing efforts to reduce underage drinking will cost money. In order to raise the money, how strongly do you favor or oppose an increase of 5 cents per drink in the tax on beer, wine, and liquor sold to pay for programs for prevention of underage drinking and to increase alcohol prevention and treatment programs?

SUPPORT FOR ALCOHOL POLICY CONTINUED

- Would you favor or oppose laws in Nevada that make it easier for adults to be held liable if they alcohol to a teenager and then someone gets hurt?
- Would you favor or oppose laws or ordinances in your community that penalize adults for hosting underage drinking parties?

These items were combined into an attitude about alcohol policy scale based on respondent ratings with 1 = strongly favor and 4 = strongly oppose.



ALCOHOL USE

The average age of first use for alcohol in the statewide telephone sample was 15.8 years. Respondents reported started drinking as early as infancy and as late as 55 years. The question asked respondents to report on age of first use for drinking more "than a sip or two" of alcohol.

Respondents were asked if they had at least one alcoholic drink in the past 30 days. This will provide an indication of norms around drinking and acceptance of alcohol, in general, for particular communities. As is evident in the resulting graph below, that displays the results from all coalition areas, there is a large variance among the regions and populations of the state.

ALCOHOL USE CONTINUED

Have you had at least one alcoholic drink in the past 30 days?



Respondents also were asked to report on how many days per week or per month during the past 30 days they had at least one drink of any alcoholic beverage.

Number of days per week	Number	Percent
1	36	42.4
2	18	21.2
3	7	8.2
4	7	8.2
5	2	2.3
6	2	2.3
7	13	15.3
Total	85	100.0

ALCOHOL USE CONTINUED

Number of days per month	Number	Percent
1	31	32.6
2	14	14.7
3	9	9.5
4	9	9.5
5	11	11.6
6	5	5.3
8	1	1.0
10	1	1.0
15	3	3.2
25	2	2.1
28	2	2.1
30	7	7.3
Total	95	100.0

Respondents also were asked how many drinks they have on average when they drank during the past 30 days. For the entire sample the average was 2.19 and the range was from 0 (none) to 12 drinks.

During the past 30 days on the days that you drank, how many drinks did you drink on average?

Number of Drinks	Number	Percent
0	2	.5
1	84	21.9
2	46	12.0
3	28	7.3
4	8	2.1
5	6	1.6
6	4	1.0
8	1	.3
10	1	.3
12	3	.8
Total	183	47.8
Missing	200	52.2
Total with Missing	383	100.0

ALCOHOL USE CONTINUED

The graph for the next question compares each coalition with the statewide percentage of respondents who said that they had had 5 or more drinks in a row at least once during the past 30 days. This is the traditional measure of binge drinking in a community. The average number of times for the statewide sample was .75 (less than 1) indicating that most respondents (N=2576) denied any drinking occasions during the past 30 days where they drank 5 or more drinks in a row.



The next graph provides a comparison among the state sample and the coalitions of the average number of drinks consumed the last time the respondent drank and drove.

ALCOHOL USE CONTINUED

Average number of drinks you had last time you drank and drove



This next graph compares each coalition area with the statewide sample for the percentage of respondents who said yes to the question about whether they had ridden with someone else who had been drinking during the past 30 days.

Percent Respondents who rode in a car driven by someone who had been drinking--last 30 days



TOBACCO USE

The first question on tobacco use asked respondents whether anyone at home smoked cigarettes.

Tobacco use in the home

The next question asked respondents whether they had smoked 100 cigarettes in their entire lives. One pack contains 20 cigarettes.

Ever smoked 100 cigarettes

The next question asked smokers if they smoked every day, some days, or not at all. The smaller portion of respondents never smoked.

	Number	Percent
Every day	56	14.6
Some days	17	4.4
Not at all	120	31.3
Total	193	50.4
Missing	190	49.6
Total with Missing	383	100.0

TOBACCO USE CONTINUED

Finally, respondents were asked how many cigarettes a day they smoked. A total of 193 respondents said they smoked and the minimum number of cigarettes anyone reported smoking on a daily basis was 0 (none) and the maximum number of cigarettes was 60. The average number smoked was 13.37.

MARIJUANA LEGALIZATION

How strongly do you favor or oppose the legalization of marijuana?

Rating	Number	Percent
Strongly favor	66	17.2
Somewhat favor	42	11.0
Somewhat oppose	44	11.5
Strongly oppose	223	58.2
Total	375	97.9
Missing	8	2.1
Total with Missing	383	100.0

DRUG USE

Drug Item	State Number	State Percent or Average	Coalition Number	Coalition Percent
Average # Times used Marijuana in the last 12 months	229	.96	19	1.05
Ever used marijuana (percent yes)	1464	33.2	112	29.2
Average # Times used Stimulants in the last 12 months	66	.21	3	.07
Ever used Stimulants (percent yes)	588	12.9	42	11.0
Did your use of stimulants include methamphetamine	329	7.1	21	5.5
How many times in the last 12 months have you used methamphetamines	33	1.70	1	.29
Average # Times used Cocaine in the last 12 months	45	.07	1	.03
Ever used Cocaine (percent yes)	614	13.4	45	11.7
Average # Times used Hallucinogens in the last 12 months	50	.09	5	.07

DRUG USE CONTINUED

Ever used Hallucinogens (percent yes)	500	10.9	30	7.8
Average # Times used Sedatives in the last 12 months	92	.32	7	.13
Ever used Sedatives (percent yes)	198	4.4	18	4.7
Average # Times used Opiates in the last 12 months	35	.09	3	.07
Ever used Opiates (percent yes)	162	3.5	13	3.4
Average # Times used Heroin in the last 12 months	58	.83	0	.00
Ever used Heroin (percent yes)	58	29.4	3	.8
Average # Times used other prescription drugs in the last 12 months	95	.19	11	.32
Ever used other prescription drugs (percent yes)	134	2.9	9	2.3

NEVADA COMMUNITY CONVENIENCE SURVEY: DATA COLLECTED BY GOSHEN COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT COALITION, SERVING CLARK COUNTY

The Nevada statewide convenience survey consisted of a sample of individuals selected by coalition members from each of ten geographic regions of the state represented by the state's substance abuse prevention coalitions, and a sample of Native American individuals from the state's many Native American communities. The ten regions constitute the entire geographic area of Nevada. These regions range in size from one county to three counties. The multi-county coalition areas of the state reflect contiguous groupings of counties with small populations.

There are a total of thirteen coalitions serving persons in Nevada, with their coverage areas shown in the table below. Each of these coalitions collected surveys for this data project. Each coalition identified populations or neighborhoods and collection strategies that would provide the best community input from individuals for their planning purposes. The Statewide Native American Coalition utilized a slightly altered version of this instrument. Four coalitions also collected data from youth using a survey tailored for that age group. All of those results, as well as the aggregated statewide data, are reported separately.

Nevada Coalition	County/-ies in coverage area
BEST Community Coalition	Clark County
Churchill Community Coalition	Churchill County
Community Council on Youth	Carson City
Eastern Nevada Community Coalition	Eureka, Lincoln, and White Pine Counties
Frontier Community Coalition	Humboldt, Lander, and Pershing Counties
Goshen Community Development Coalition	Clark County
Healthy Communities Coalition	Lyon, Storey, and Mineral Counties
Join Together Northern Nevada	Washoe County
Luz Community Development Coalition	Clark County – Hispanic community
Nye Community Coalition	Esmeralda and Nye Counties
Partners Allied for Community Excellence	Elko County
Partnership of Community Resources	Douglas County
Statewide Native American Coalition	Twenty-seven tribal communities across state and urban area Native Americans

A total of 9,162 surveys was collected utilizing the three survey instruments (community –6,450, Native American – 1,253, and youth – 1,459), exceeding the total target twofold. This report describes the community instruments collected by the Goshen Community Development Coalition, serving Clark County.

DEMOGRAPHICS

Coalition

Coalition	Number	Percent
Goshen Community Development Coalition	586	100.0

What County do you live in?

County	Number	Percent
Clark	580	99.0
White Pine	2	.3
Total	582	99.3
Missing	4	.7
Total with Missing	586	100.0

Respondents also identified their zip codes.

What is your age?

Age Category	Number	Percent
15-17	72	12.3
18-20	37	6.3
21-24	62	10.6
25-30	99	16.9
31-35	107	18.3
36-40	87	14.8
41-50	57	9.7
51-60	33	5.6
61-70	21	3.6
71+	9	1.5
Total	584	99.7
Missing	2	.3
Total with Missing	586	100.0

Male/Female

Gender	Number	Percent
Male	199	34.0
Female	368	62.8
Total	567	96.8
Missing	19	3.2
Total with Missing	586	100.0

Respondents could mark multiple categories for race. The following tables and narrative describe the racial composition of the sample.

DEMOGRAPHICS CONTINUED

Are you Hispanic or Latino?

	Number	Percent
Yes	154	26.3

Respondents who marked White

	Number	Percent
Yes	169	28.8

Respondents who marked American Indian

	Number	Percent
Yes	12	2.0

Respondents who marked Asian

	Number	Percent
Yes	40	6.8

Respondents who marked Black or African American

	Number	Percent
Yes	212	36.2

Respondents who marked the other category also could write down their racial background.

NORMS

Respondents were asked how wrong most people in their community think it is to binge drink and how wrong most community people think it is for underage youth (15-20 years) to drink. Both these questions were rated using a scale from "very wrong" = 4 to "not wrong at all" = 1. Higher scores on the scale comprised of these items (average scores were calculated) indicated the group thought it was very wrong. Scores ranged from 1 to 4 after the average score was calculated.

The average score on the scale about drinking norms was 3.13 indicating that the group thinks that it is wrong to binge drink and for underage youth to drink, but it is not considered very wrong.



NORMS CONTINUED

Social Community Norms

Rating	Number	Percent
Not wrong at all	22	3.8
1.50	27	4.6
A little wrong	59	10.1
2.50	50	8.5
Wrong	136	23.2
3.50	71	12.1
Very wrong	210	35.8
Total	575	98.1
Missing	11	1.9
Total with Missing	586	100.0

The next question also was rated using a four-point scale but the scale was rated from "strongly disagree" = 1 to "strongly agree" = 4. The average score on this question for the group was 2.38.

Underage drinking is a rite of passage and not likely to change

Rating	Number	Percent
Strongly Disagree	117	20.0
Disagree	181	30.9
Agree	179	30.5
Strongly Agree	73	12.5
Total	550	93.9
Missing	36	6.1
Total with Missing	586	100.0

SOCIAL ACCESS

Social access included items that asked respondents about how youth acquire alcohol and focused on access from family, parents, strangers, and friends. The first scale is a composite of responses to the question about how easy or difficult it is for youth to alcohol from older siblings, parents, friends, and adults / strangers. Each source was rated separately using the scale 1= "very easy" to 4 = "very difficult". The responses for these ratings were added together and divided by 4 to develop a social access scale with scores that ranged from 1 to 4.



Mean Scale: Social Access

Rating	Number	Percent
1.00 very easy	430	6.7
1.00	57	9.7
1.25	14	2.4
1.50	20	3.4
1.75	27	4.6
2.00 easy	118	20.1
2.25	49	8.4
2.50	67	11.4
2.67	1	.2
2.75	37	6.3
3.00 difficult	91	15.5
3.25	20	3.4
3.50	16	2.7
3.67	1	.2

SOCIAL ACCESS CONTINUED

Rating	Number	Percent
3.75	6	1.0
4.00 very difficult	56	9.6
Total	580	99.0
Missing	6	1.0
Total with Missing	586	100.0

How easy or difficult do you think it would be for underage youth to get beer, wine coolers, or liquor from home without their parents knowing it?

Rating	Number	Percent
Very easy	104	17.7
Easy	202	34.5
Difficult	203	34.6
Very difficult	72	12.3
Total	581	99.1
Missing	5	.9
Total with Missing	586	100.0

How often do you think parents in your community provide alcohol at parties their children host?

Rating	Number	Percent
Never	69	11.8
Sometimes, but not that often	258	44.0
Often	201	34.3
Very often	48	8.2
Total	576	98.3
Missing	10	1.7
Total with Missing	586	100.0

SOCIAL ACCESS CONTINUED

When you think about underage youth, where do you think they usually obtain alcohol?

Item	Number	Percent
Friends	401	68.4
Parents	99	16.9
Strangers	87	14.8
Other Family members	127	21.7

This table should be understood in the context of the entire sample of individuals who completed the survey. This table, and the one that follows under Retail Access, are built from one question that asked about multiple sources of alcohol, some social, some retail. Respondents could choose more than one response, so the responses total to more than 100%. The key observation here is that most respondents believe social sources, especially friends, are the primary source of alcohol for underage youth.

RETAIL ACCESS

When you think about underage youth, where do you think they usually obtain alcohol?

Item	Number	Percent
a liquor store	53	9
a bar	20	3.4
a restaurant	9	1.5
a grocery store	56	9.6
a convenience store	62	10.6

Along with the preceding table, this table is constructed from the question that allowed multiple responses about access to alcohol by underage youth, and the responses from the two tables exceed 100%. Based on this question, a few types of retail establishments are considered retail sources of alcohol for youth. However, in the context of the previous table, it is clear that social sources are viewed as the primary source of alcohol for underage youth.

How well does your community monitor the location of alcohol outlets and bars?

Rating	Number	Percent
Not at all well	74	12.6
Not well	174	29.7
Sort of well	177	30.2
Very well	131	22.4
Total	556	94.9
Missing	30	5.1
Total with Missing	586	100.0

RETAIL ACCESS CONTINUED

Those serving alcohol in my community are properly trained to do so

Rating	Number	Percent
Strongly Disagree	147	25.1
Disagree	199	34.0
Agree	166	28.3
Strongly Agree	35	6.0
Total	547	93.3
Missing	39	6.7
Total with Missing	586	100.0

The next tables were answered by the portion of the sample that was under 21 years of age (minors).

During the past 30 days, if you bought alcohol at a store such as a grocery store, liquor store, convenience store, or gas station, did the person check your ID?

ID check at retail sales source



During the past 30 days, did anyone ever refuse to sell you alcohol because of your age?

Option	Number	Percent without Missing
I did not try to buy alcohol in the past 30 days	47	54.0
Yes, someone refused to sell me alcohol because of my age	23	26.4
No, my age did not keep me from buying alcohol	17	19.5
Total	87	100.0
Missing	499	
Total with Missing	586	

RETAIL ACCESS CONTINUED

How many stores do you know of that would sell you alcohol without asking you for ID or proof of age?

Number of stores	Number	Percent without Missing
0	25	46.3
1	2	3.7
2	11	20.4
3	12	22.2
4	1	1.9
5	2	3.7
6	1	1.9
Total	54	100.0
Missing	532	
Total with Missing	586	

PERCEPTION OF RISK

If you were to drink and drive, what do you think would happen to you?

Item	Number	Percent
The police would catch me.	119	20.3
I would get a ticket and pay a fine.	279	47.6
I would go to jail for a night.	169	28.8
Nothing would happen to me.	67	11.4
Anything else?	18	3.1

For anything else, respondents suggested:

- Have to go to AA meetings
- Accident
- Community service
- Die
- DWI
- Embarrassed
- Get my parents in trouble
- Grounded
- Higher insurance
- Hurt somebody else
- Impound car

PERCEPTION OF RISK CONTINUED

- Jail
- Lose job
- Lose license
- Mom would kill me
- Probation
- Public humiliation
- Suspend license.

Respondents were also asked if they agreed that law enforcement does very little to stop underage drinking. This item was scored using the "strongly disagree" = 1 to "strongly agree" = 4 rating.

Law enforcement does very little to stop underage drinking.

Rating	Number	Percent
Strongly Disagree	107	18.3
Disagree	148	25.3
Agree	235	40.1
Strongly Agree	59	10.1
Total	549	93.7
Missing	37	6.3
Total with Missing	586	100.0

PROMOTION

Two items studied promotion. Respondents rated these using four point scales with 1 = "not at all well" or "strongly disagree" and 4 = "very well" or "strongly agree".

How well does your community monitor the location of alcohol advertising?

Rating	Number	Percent
Not at all well	75	12.8
Not well	178	30.4
Sort of well	183	31.2
Very well	121	20.6
Total	557	95.1
Missing	29	4.9
Total with Missing	586	100.0

PROMOTION CONTINUED

Alcohol advertising should not be allowed at events attended by children such as sporting events or community celebrations.

Rating	Number	Percent
Strongly Disagree	119	20.3
Disagree	129	22.0
Agree	169	28.8
Strongly Agree	135	23.0
Total	552	94.2
Missing	34	5.8
Total with Missing	586	100.0

OUTCOMES

A scale was developed using three questions with the answer ratings that ranged from 1= "not a problem" to 4 = "a serious problem". The three questions asked how serious a problem underage drinking is at unsupervised, informal gatherings in the community; how serious a problem alcohol related motor vehicle crashes are in the community; and how serious a problem drinking and driving is in the community. The average score for the scale was 2.85 indicating the respondents think these problems are slightly more than "somewhat of a problem".



OUTCOMES CONTINUED

Serious Problem scale responses

Rating	Number	Percent
1.00 Not a problem at all	6	1.0
1.33	11	1.9
1.50	3	.5
1.67	31	5.3
2.00 Somewhat of a problem	79	13.5
2.33	41	7.0
2.50	5	.9
2.67	73	12.5
3.00 Serious problem	149	25.4
3.33	67	11.4
3.50	2	.3
3.67	51	8.7
4.00 Very serious problem	65	11.1
Total	583	99.5
Missing	3	.5
Total with Missing	586	100.0

The next outcomes question asked respondents to identify the percentage of youth under 21 years of age who drank alcohol during the past 30 days. Percentages ranged from 0 to 100 with approximately 6.8% of the sample saying 50% and 3.4 % of the sample identifying 75%. The average percentage identified by the group overall was 40.16%. Less than 2% of the sample said that 0% (none) of underage youth in the area drank alcohol during the past 30 days.

If you drink alcohol, during the past 30 days, on how many days did you have 5 or more drinks of alcohol in a row?

Number of days	Number	Percent	Percent without Missing
0 days	165	28.2	31.3
1 day	92	15.7	17.5
2 days	85	14.5	16.1
3-5 days	90	15.4	17.1
6-9 days	40	6.8	7.6
10-19 days	23	3.9	4.4
20 or more days	32	5.5	6.1
Total	527	89.9	100.0
Missing	59	10.1	
Total with Missing	586	100.0	

The average number of days for this question was 1.89. However, 362 or 68% reported binge drinking during the previous thirty days.

OUTCOMES CONTINUED

How many times did you drink and drive in the past 30 days?



Across the state there is a great deal of variability in the responses for this question. For some areas, the average number of times is close to 0 (Community Council on Youth, .153) while for other regions, the average number of times is greater than once a month that respondents said they drank and drove (Goshen, 1.019).

If you drink, during the past 30 days, how many times did you drive a car or other vehicle when you had been drinking alcohol?

Number of times	Number	Percent
0 times	245	41.8
1 time	129	22.0
2 or 3 times	87	14.8
4 or 5 times	36	6.1
6 or more times	32	5.5
Total	529	90.3
Missing	57	9.7
Total with Missing	586	100.0

The average number of times during the past 30 days was 1.01 (less than 1). Of those who responded affirmatively, 284 or 53.6% reported that they had driven a car at least once when they had been drinking.

Agency/Organization Name	Contact & Title	Address	Phone & Email
Nevada Prevention Resource Center	**Asteriadis, Stephanie**	WRB 1021 MS/284 University of Nevada, Reno Reno, NV 89557	775-784-6336 866-784-6336 775-527-0704 sasteriadis@casat.org
Department of Child & Family Services, Nevada State Juvenile Justice Programs Office	**Bartosz, Kathy** **Grants & Projects Analyst II**	4126 Technology Way, 3rd Floor Carson City, NV 89706	775-684-7294 kgbartos@dcfs.state.nv.us
Nevada State Substance Abuse Prevention and Treatment Agency	**Burden, Stevie** **Health Program Specialist II**	4126 Technology Way, 2nd Floor Carson City, NV 89706	775-684-4080 sburden@sapta.nv.gov
Nevada State Substance Abuse Prevention and Treatment Agency	**Canfield, Maria** **Agency Director**	4126 Technology Way, 2nd Floor Carson City, NV 89706	775-684-4190 mcanfirld@sapta.nv.gov
Nevada State Health Division Abstinence-Only Education Coordinator Immunization program	**Cowee, Jessica** **Health Program Specialist I**	3427 Goni Road Suite 108 Carson City, NV 89706	775-684-4256 jcowee@nvhd.state.nv.us
Nevada State Health Division – Maternal Child Health Services	**Devine, Kyle** **Health Program Specialist II**	3427 Goni Road Suite 108 Carson City, NV 89706	775-684-4264 kdevine@nvhd.state.nv.us
Nevada State Bureau of Community Health, Communicable Disease Control – Chronic Disease Manager	**Herst, Charlene** **Health Program Manager II**	505 E. King St.., #103 Carson City, NV 89701	775-684-5914 cherst@nvhd.state.nv.us
Statewide Partnership	**Linda Lang** **Coordinator**	4380 Ramuda Circle Carson City, NV 89701	775-882-6674 dlhlang@pyramid.net
Nevada State Substance Abuse Prevention and Treatment Agency	**Kailash, Vidya** **Health Program Specialist I**	4126 Technology Way, 2nd Floor Carson City, NV 89706	775-684-4066 vkailash@sapta.nv.gov
CSAP s Western CAPT Nevada Liaison	**Sheehan, Denise** **Prevention Application Management Coordinator**	CSAP s Western Center for the Application of Prevention Technologies – Univ. of Nevada, Reno -- CASAT/Mail Stop 279 Reno, Nevada 89557-0258	775-682-7441 dsheehan@casat.org
Nevada State Substance Abuse Prevention and Treatment Agency	**Wolf, Tonya** **Health Program Specialist I**	4126 Technology Way, 2nd Floor Carson City, NV 89706	775-684-4190 twolf@sapta.nv.gov

Coalition Name	COUNTIES	Director	Address	Phone & Email
The BEST Coalition Corporation	**Clark**	Sandy Wallace	3075 E. Flamingo Rd., 100A Las Vegas, NV 89121	702-385-0684 swallace@bestcoalition.com
Churchill Community Coalition	**Churchill**	Dennis Lee	97 Whitaker Lane Fallon, NV 89406	775-423-7433 dlee@churchillcoalition.org
Carson City Community Council on Youth	**Carson City**	Eric Ohlson	P.O. Box 613 Carson City, NV 89702	775-841-4730 eric@ccoy.org
Goshen-7th Judicial District d.b.a. Eastern Nevada Communities Coalition	**White Pine Eureka Lincoln**	Belinda Thompson	1117 Tumbleweed Ave. Las Vegas, NV 89106	702-880-4357 goshencoalition@aol.com
Frontier Community Coalition	**Humboldt & Pershing & Lander**	Jaclyn Lafferty	P.O. Box 2123 Winnemucca, NV 89446	775-623-6382 info@frontiercommunity.org
Goshen Community Development Coalition	**Clark**	Belinda Thompson	1117 Tumbleweed Ave. Las Vegas, NV 89106	702-880-4357 goshencoalition@aol.com
Healthy Communities Coalition of Lyon & Storey	**Lyon, Storey & Mineral**	Christy McGill	P.O. Box 517 Dayton, NV 89403	775-246-7550 cmcgill@healthycomm.org
Join Together Northern Nevada Washoe Coalition	**Washoe**	Kevin Quint	1325 Airmotive Way, #325 Reno, NV 89502	775-324-7557 kquint@jtnn.org
Luz Community Development Coalition	**Serving Latinos in Clark Co**	Olga Mendoza	1117 Tumbleweed Ave. Las Vegas, NV 89106	702-880-4357 olgam1998@yahoo.com
Nye Communities Coalition	**Nye & Esmeralda**	Stacy Smith	2280 E. Calvada Blvd., #103 Pahrump, NV 89048	775-727-9970 stacy@nyecc.org
Partners Allied for Community Excellence	**Elko**	Cathy McAdoo	249 Third Street Elko, NV 89801	775-777-3451 pacecoalition@frontiernet.net
Partnership of Community Resources Inc.	**Douglas**	Cheryl Bricker	P.O. Box 651 Minden, NV 89423	775-782-8611 pcrbricker@partnership-resource.org pcrhigginson@partnership-resource.org
Inter-Tribal Council of Nevada d.b.a. Statewide Native American Coalition	**Statewide**	Monty Williams	680 Greenbrae Drive, Ste 265 Sparks, NV 89431	775-741-0716 mwilliams@oasisol.com

INTERVIEWING PROTOCOL

Strata	Target	Actual Completes
Washoe	384	**384**
Humboldt, Pershing, Lander	384	**383**
Churchill	384	**545**
Douglas	384	**409**
Carson City	384	**391**
Storey, Lyon, Mineral	384	**477**
Esmerelda, Nye	384	**406**
Elko	384	**405**
Eureka, White Pine, Lincoln	384	**430**
Clark	384	**383**
Hispanic surname sample	384	**435**
Total	4,224	4,648

INTERVIEWS BY LANGUAGE & STRATA

Strata	English	Spanish
Washoe	373	**11**
Humboldt, Pershing, Lander	378	**5**
Churchill	541	**4**
Douglas	405	**4**
Carson City	384	**7**
Storey, Lyon, Mineral	469	**8**
Esmerelda, Nye	405	**1**
Elko	393	**12**
Eureka, White Pine, Lincoln	428	**2**
Clark	350	**33**
Hispanic surname sample	268	**167**
Total	4,394	254

RESPONSE & REFUSAL RATES BY STRATA

Strata	Casro Rate	Cooperation Rate	Refusal Rate	Refusal Conversion Rate
Washoe	33.18%	60.28%	5.22%	**9.45%**
Humboldt, Pershing, Lander	45.15%	68.44%	4.16%	**13.45%**
Churchill	42.85%	68.22%	7.17%	**16.88%**
Douglas	38.53%	67.74%	5.13%	**11.75%**
Carson City	36.55%	60.03%	6.23%	**11.51%**
Storey,Lyon, Mineral	39.76%	64.92%	6.24%	**12.41%**
Esmerelda, Nye	36.98%	62.83%	6.79%	**11.86%**
Elko	40.27%	65.70%	5.29%	**13.86%**
Eureka, White Pine, Lincoln	44.87%	68.45%	5.15%	**14.48%**
Clark	34.07%	61.24%	4.97%	**9.73%**
Hispanic surname sample	17.76%	52.00%	6.41%	**7.28%**
Overall	36.10%	63.29%	5.66%	11.45%